

THE STŪPA CULT AND THE EXTANT PĀLI VINAYA

One of the more curious things about the Pāli *Vinaya* as we have it is that it contains no rules governing the behaviour of monks in regard to *stūpas*. In this respect it is, among the various *Vinayas* that have come down to us, unique: “tous les *Vinayapiṭaka* ... à la seule exception du *Vinaya pāli*, contiennent”, according to A. Bareau, “d’intéressantes données concernant la construction et le culte des *stūpa*”.¹ Professor Bareau seems to see the absence of such “données” in the Pāli *Vinaya* as a function of the chronology of the compilation of the various *Vinayas*, and seems to suggest that the absence of such material in the Pāli *Vinaya* results from the relatively earlier date of the ‘closing’ of its compilation.² Gustav Roth explains the absence of such rules in the Pāli *Vinaya* in a somewhat different way: “The Pāli tradition apparently did not include such a section, as the compilers of the ancient Pāli canon were governed by a tradition according to which the construction and worship of a *stūpa* was the concern of laymen, and not of monks. Therefore, there was felt to be no need for a particular *stūpa*-section to be included in the *Kandhaka*-section of the Pāli *Vinaya*”.³ There is, however, a passage in a 12th Century Sinhalese *Katikāvata*, or monastic

¹ A. Bareau, “La construction et le culte des stūpa d’après les *vinayapiṭaka*”, *Bulletin de l’école française d’extrême-orient* 50 (1960) 229: my emphasis.

² Bareau, *Bulletin de l’école française d’extrême-orient* 50 (1960) 230; 267-68; 273-74.

³ G. Roth, “Symbolism of the Buddhist Stūpa according to the Tibetan Version of the Caitya-vibhāga-vinayodbhāva-sūtra, the Sanskrit Treatise Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana, and a Corresponding Passage in Kuladatta’s Kriyāsamgraha”, *The Stūpa. Its Religious, Historical and Architectural Significance*, ed. A.L. Dallapiccola & S.Z. Lallemand (Wiesbaden: 1980) 186; K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature. Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism* (A History of Indian Literature, ed. J. Gonda, Vol. VII, Fasc. 2) (Wiesbaden: 1983) 23, cites Roth’s explanation as probable.

code, a passage in the *Visuddhimagga*, and several passages in the *Sutta-vibhaṅga*, which might suggest quite a different possible explanation.

The *Mahā-Parākramabāhu Katikāvata*, which has come down to us in a 12th Century inscription from Galvihāra,⁴ was promulgated as a part of one of the many attempts to “purify” or “reform” the Śri Lankan *Saṅgha*, and its authors claim that it “was formulated also without deviating from the tradition of the lineage of preceptors [ādurol = ācārya-kula] and after the consultation of Dhamma and Vinaya”.⁵ One of the sections intended to regulate the daily life of the monks says, in part, in Ratnapala’s translation:

“They should rise at dawn and pass the time walking up and down (for the sake of bodily exercise). Thereafter they should wear the cīvara covering themselves properly with it and after they have finished cleaning the teeth and have attended to the duties specified in the *Khandhaka* such as the duties pertaining to *Stūpas*, the great bodhi-tree, the temple terrace, the teachers, the Theras, the sick and the lodging places (*dahagab māmbo* āṅgana-vatu-du āduru-vat tera-vat gilan-vat senasun-vat ā kandu-vatu-du sapayā), should if need arise enter the refectory ... ”⁶

⁴ This inscription was first published in E. Müller, *Ancient Inscriptions in Ceylon*, 2 Vols. (London: 1883) Text: pp. 87-90; 120-24; Plates: no. 137. It was re-edited in D.M. de Zilva Wickremasinghe, “Polonnaruva, Gal-Vihara: Rock-Inscription of Parakrama Bahu I”, *Epigraphia Zeylonica* 2 (1928) 256-83; and most recently in N. Ratnapala, *The Katikāvatas. Laws of the Buddhist Order of Ceylon from the 12th Century to the 18th Century* (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft N) (München: 1971) 37-44; 127-35.

⁵ Ratnapala, *The Katikāvatas*, 38, 129; 304.

⁶ Ratnapala, *The Katikāvatas*, 40, § 12 (text); 131-32 (translation). Exactly the same reading of the text was given earlier by de Zilva Wickremasinghe, and his translation of it differs only very slightly: “ ... and have attended to the duties specified in the *Khandhaka*, such as those rules of conduct in respect of the Dāgābas, etc.” (*Epigraphia Zeylonica* 2 (1928) 271, 275). (The version of this passage repeated in the *Darñbadeni Katikāvata*, which “belongs to the reign of king Parākramabāhu II (1236-1270 A.D.)”, differs slightly: *dahagab mahabō*

It would appear from his translation that Ratnapala understood the *Katikāvata* to be saying that all the “duties” enumerated here were “specified” in the *Khandhaka*, and that he assumes that *Khandhaka*- here refers to the portion of the *Vinaya* so named. But this would suggest, if Ratnapala’s interpretation of the text is correct, that the authorities who drafted this *Katikāvata* in the 12th Century knew — and presupposed that their intended audience knew — a *Khandhaka* which contained rules concerning “duties pertaining to *Stūpas*”. The *Khandhaka-vatta*, or “duties specified in the *Khandhaka*”, were, again according to Ratnapala, specifically identified by Mahāsvāmi Śāriputra — a leading figure and *Vinaya* authority contemporary with the promulgation of the *Katikāvata* — with “the major and minor duties enumerated in the *Vatta-khandhaka*, i.e. Vin II 207-30”.⁷ Śāriputra, then, also understood *Khandhaka-vatta* to refer to the text of the *Vinaya*, and his specificity, in fact, should make it easy to locate these rules. But when we look at Vin II 207-30 it becomes clear that although there are now rules there regarding “the teachers, the Theras, the sick and the lodging places”, Vin II 207-30, as we have it, does not contain a word about *stūpas*. This might suggest either that Śāriputra was wrong in his identification of the *Khandhaka-vatta* with these specific pages, or that the compilers of the *Katikāvata* knew — and expected contemporaries to have — a *Vinaya* different from the one we have, a *Vinaya* which had a fuller text of Vin II 207-30 than the one that has come down to us. Oddly enough, even if Śāriputra was wrong in his specific identification we are still left in much the same position: even if the *Katikāvata* is not specifically referring to Vin II 207-30 it must at

āṅgana-vatu-du āduru-vat tera-vat gilan-vat senasun-vat ā vatu-du sapayā (61, § 96). It is hard to know for certain whether the omission here of *kandu-* is anything but scribal. It is not noted by Ratnapala, nor reflected in his translation, 158, § 96).

⁷ Ratnapala, *The Katikāvatas*, 193, 197; cf. 290. References to the Pāli *Vinaya* are here and throughout to the Pali Text Society edition by H. Oldenberg.

least be referring to the *Vinaya*,⁸ and it is not just in Vin II 207-30 that there are no references to “duties pertaining to *Stūpas*”, there are no references to such duties anywhere in the Pāli *Vinaya* that we know. It is, however, not just the authors of our *Katikāvata* who appear possibly to have known a Pāli *Vinaya* different from the one we have.

Buddhaghosa refers on several occasions in his *Visuddhimagga* to the *Khandhaka* and there is, I think, no doubt about what he understood by the term. In one place he says: *ubhato-Vibhangapariyāpānnam vā ādibrahmacariyakam, khandhakavattapariyāpānnam ābhisaṁcariyam*, which Pe Maung Tin translates as “Or, that which is included in both the Vibhanga’s is the ‘major precept’; that which is included in the *Khandhaka* duties is the ‘minor precept’”.⁹ At another place he refers to the “proper duties” promulgated by the Blessed One in the *Khandhaka* (*yan tam bhagavatā ... khandhake sammāvattam paññattam*) and then quotes a passage similar to that found in our *Katikāvata* which is found

now at Vin II 231.¹⁰ It seems fairly obvious, then, that when Buddhaghosa uses the terms *Khandhaka* or *Khandhaka-vatta* he is always referring to the text of the “canonical” *Vinaya* which he knew. This is of some importance because in yet another passage in his *Visuddhimagga* he refers his readers to the *Khandhaka* for rules regarding many of the same things that the *Mahā-Parākramabāhu-katikāvata* refers to. The passage in question reads:

āgantukam pana bhikkhum disvā āgantukapaṭisanthāro kātabbova. avasesāni pi cetiyaṅgaṇavatta-bodhiyaṅgaṇavatta-uposathāgāravatta-bhojanasālājantāghara-ācariyupajjhāya-āgantuka-gamikavattādīni sabbāni khandhakavattāni pūretabbān’ eva

which Pe Maung Tin translates as:

“On seeing a guest-monk, he should give him the greetings due to a guest. All the remaining *Khandhaka* duties should be performed, such as the duties of the shrine-yard, the yard of the Bo-tree, the sacred-service hall, the dining-hall, the fire-room, the duties towards the teacher, the preceptor, guests”.¹¹

It is clear from his translation that Pe Maung Tin understood *Khandhaka* in the *Visuddhimagga* to be a proper name or the title of a work. Rhys Davids and Stede before him understood the term in the *Visuddhimagga* in the same way. Citing the same passages we have cited above from the *Visuddhimagga* Rhys Davids and Stede defined *khandhakavatta* as “duties or observances specified in the v. *khandha* or chapter of the *Vinaya* which deals with these duties”.¹² But if these scholars are correct, then it is hard to avoid concluding from the passage just cited that, like the authors of the *Katikāvata* who knew a *Khandhaka* containing rules “pertaining to *stūpas*”, Buddhaghosa knew a *Khandhaka*

⁸ Cf. T.W. Rhys Davids & W. Stede, *The Pali Text Society’s Pali-English Dictionary* (London: 1921-25) 234; Pe Maung Tin, *The Path of Purity* (Pali Text Society Trans. Series, Nos. 11, 17, 21) (London: 1923-31; repr. 1971) 14 n. 4; 117 n. 3; etc.; which are discussed more fully below.

⁹ H.C. Warren & D. Kosambi, *Visuddhimagga of Buddhaghosācariya* (Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 41) (Cambridge: 1950) I.27 (p. 10); Pe Maung Tin, *The Path of Purity*, 14. In addition to the instances in the *Visuddhimagga*, Buddhaghosa frequently refers to the *Khandhakavatta* in the *Samantapāsādikā* (see H. Kopp, *Samantapāsādikā. Buddhaghosa’s Commentary on the Vinaya Pitaka*, Vol. VIII (Indexes to Vols. I-VII) (Pali Text Society Text Series No. 167) (London: n.d.) 1511), at least. Although these references add some detail, they do not seem to suggest a referent for the term other than the text of the *Vinaya*. It should, however, be noted that the “conclusions” drawn in what follows about the *Khandhaka* known to Buddhaghosa raise some serious questions about the relationship of the *Samantapāsādikā* to the text of the *Vinaya* it was commenting on, and the nature and extent of that text. Such problems will only be resolved by a careful and thorough study of this massive commentary in comparison with the *Vinaya* as we have it. Such a study remains to be done.

¹⁰ Warren & Kosambi, *Visuddhimagga* III.71 (p. 82); Pe Maung Tin, *The Path of Purity*, 117. For other similar *Vinaya* passages see Vin II 223; I 46 foll.

¹¹ Warren & Kosambi, *Visuddhimagga* VI.60 (p. 153); Pe Maung Tin, *The Path of Purity*, 215.

¹² Rhys Davids & Stede, *The Pali Text Society’s Pali-English Dictionary*, 234.

that contained rules concerning “the shrine-yard” or *cetiyaṅgana*. Since he was — again like the authors of the *Katikāvata* — giving practical instructions to his “readers” it is again difficult to avoid the assumption that he assumed that they would know or be able to consult a similar *Khandhaka*. But, although the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya* preserved in Chinese, for example, has rules concerning what Professor Bareau translates as “l’enceinte du *stūpa*”,¹³ and although the Sanskrit version of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* has rules regarding the *stūpāṅgana*,¹⁴ the Pāli *Vinaya* as we have it does not have a single reference to the *cetiyaṅgana* or *stūpāṅgana*.¹⁵

Unless Ratnapala, Pe Maung Tin, Rhys Davids and Stede are all wrong in their interpretation of the compound *khandhakavatta*, unless, in short, we do not understand what the term actually refers to, these two passages — one from the 5th Century *Visuddhimagga*, the other from a 12th Century Sinhalese *Katikāvata* — seem to suggest that there is a distinct probability that the Pāli *Vinaya*, like virtually all the other *Vinayas* known to us, had once contained specific “duties pertaining to *stūpas*” and “duties of the shrine-yard”. It is, moreover, not just sources external to the Pāli *Vinaya* like the *Visuddhimagga* and *Mahā-*

¹³ Bareau, *Bulletin de l’école française d’extrême-orient* 50 (1960) 251, 253.

¹⁴ R. Gnoli, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaranavastu. Being the 15th and 16th Sections of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin* (Serie Orientale Roma L.) (Roma: 1978) 38.29; 39.2.

¹⁵ Questions concerning “duties in regard to the yard of the Bo-tree” in the Pāli and other *Vinayas* will also have to be investigated; but given our ignorance in regard to the place of “Bo-trees” in Indian monastic communities, and given the great importance assigned to their presence in Sri Lanka, this will require a separate study. It is, however, perhaps worth noting here that the only clear reference that I know in Indian inscriptional sources to a shrine connected with a Bo-tree explicitly connects that “shrine” with a Sri Lankan monastic community. The “Second Apsidal Temple Inscription F” from Nāgārjunikonda records the benefactions of the Upāsikā Bodhisiri. One of these is said to have been the construction of “a shrine for the Bodhi-tree at the Sihala-vihāra”: *sīhala-vihāre bodhi-rukha-pāsādo* (J.Ph. Vogel, “Prakrit Inscriptions from a Buddhist Site at Nagarjunikonda”, *Epigraphia Indica* 20 (1929-30) 22-23).

Parākramabāhu-katikāvata which seem to suggest that this *Vinaya* may have originally contained such rules. There are indications within the Pāli *Vinaya* itself which would seem to point to much the same conclusion.

Although, as we have already noted, the Pāli *Vinaya* as we have it, and more particularly the *Khandhaka*, has no rules specifically governing behaviour in regard to *stūpas*, *stūpas* — or at least *cetiyas* — are taken for granted as an integral part of the monastic life in at least four passages in the *Sutta-vibhaṅga*. We might look briefly at these.

In discussing the passage from the *Visuddhimagga* above I have assumed that Buddhaghosa’s *cetiyaṅgana* was the Pāli equivalent for the *Mūlasarvāstivādin stūpāṅgana* and of the “l’enceinte du *stūpa*” found in the Chinese *Vinayas*. Given the narrative uses and descriptions of the *cetiyaṅgana* in Buddhaghosa it would be hard to argue otherwise. But if this equivalence of *cetiya* and *stūpa* holds here it may hold elsewhere as well. Two of the four passages from the *Sutta-vibhaṅga* which concern us, for example, deal with property rights in, and the tripartite economic structure of, Buddhist monastic establishments. The first of these — Vin III 266 — reads:

saṅghassa parinatam aññasaṅghassa vā cetiyassa vā pariṇāmeti, āpatti dukkaṭassa. cetiyassa parinatam aññacetiyyassa vā saṅghassa vā puggalassa vā pariṇāmeti, āpatti dukkaṭassa. puggalassa parinatam aññapuggalassa vā saṅghassa vā cetiyassa vā pariṇāmeti, āpatti dukkaṭassa.

And I.B. Horner translates the passage as:

“If he appropriates what was apportioned to the Order for another (part of the) Order or for a shrine, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he appropriates what was apportioned to a shrine for an Order or for an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he appropriates what was apportioned to an individual for another individual or for an Order or for a shrine, there is an offence of wrong-doing”.¹⁶

¹⁶ I.B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, Vol. II (London: 1940) 162.

This passage, and the virtually identical passage at Vin IV 156, can, I think, only represent the Pāli versions of similar discussions of property rights found in Sanskrit in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and in several *Vinayas* now preserved in Chinese. In the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, for example, we find:

bhagavān āha | sarvasamgham sannipātyāsau laksitavyah | kim sambhinnakārī na vā iti | yadi sambhinnakārī | sāṃghikam staupikam karoti | staupikam vā sāṃghikam | evam adhārmikam |
 “The Blessed One said: ‘Having assembled the whole community, this is to be considered: is this a (case for) making a full division [or: ‘mixed distribution’], or is it not? If there is a full division (and) it takes what belongs to the Saṅgha as what belongs to the *stūpa*, or what belongs to the *stūpa* as what belongs to the Saṅgha — such (a procedure) is not in conformity with the Dharma (*de lta bu chos dang mi mthun pa yin pas*)’.¹⁷

In regard to the Chinese *Vinayas* Professor Bareau notes, for example, that “les Sarvāstivādin parlent aussi des biens inépuisables du *stūpa*, qui sont inaliénables. Les biens qui sont donnés en offrande au *stūpa* ne peuvent être utilisés à d’autres fins. On ne doit pas les mélanger avec les biens de la Communauté des quatre directions, ni avec les biens consistant en nourriture, ni avec les biens à partager”.¹⁸

¹⁷ N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. III, Part 2 (Srinagar: 1942) 145.15-146.1; D.T. Suzuki, *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition* (Tokyo-Kyoto: 1955) 41, 284-2-2 foll. I am not altogether sure I have completely understood this passage. The text is extremely terse and the technical meaning of *sambhinnakārī* is not well established. I have followed my understanding of the Tibetan translation and the problems do not in any case affect my point here: discussions of property rights similar to those in the Pāli *Sutta-vibhaṅga* which occur in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* refer frequently to *staupika* or indicate that what is *buddhasantaka* is to be used for the *stūpa*; cf. *Gilgit Manuscripts* III 2, 143.11; Peking, Vol. 44, 95-3-4 foll.; etc.

¹⁸ Bareau, *Bulletin de l’école française d’extrême-orient* 50 (1960) 257; cf. J. Gernet, *Les aspects économiques du bouddhisme dans la société chinoise du V^e*

It would seem fairly certain that the *Sutta-vibhaṅga* passage, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* passage, and the Sarvāstivādin material summarized by Bareau are all dealing with the same basic concern: the distribution of property to, and the ownership rights of, the different corporate or juristic entities within a monastic establishment. The fact that in exactly similar contexts the Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinayas* speak of *stūpas* or that which “belongs to the *stūpas*” (*staupika*), and the Pāli *Sutta-vibhaṅga* speaks of *cetiyas*, would seem again to suggest that the two terms are equivalent, that *cetiya* in these contexts is the Pāli equivalent for *stūpa*. It is interesting to note that the Pāli preference for *cetiya* may in fact represent a relatively late South Indian influence on the vocabulary of the Pāli *Vinaya*. At Nāgārjunikonda, for example, what elsewhere would be called a *stūpa* is, in the inscriptions, consistently referred to as a *cetiya*.¹⁹

au X^e siècle (Paris: 1956) 61 foll.; 159 foll. For the persistence in Mahāyāna sūtra literature of both the vocabulary and conception of ownership found in the various *Vinayas* see G. Schopen, “Burial ‘ad sanctos’ and the Physical Presence of the Buddha in Early Indian Buddhism: A Study in the Archeology of Religions”, *Religion* 17 (1987) 207-08.

¹⁹ cf. G. Schopen, “On the Buddha and His Bones: The Conception of a Relic in the Inscriptions of Nāgārjunikonda”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 108 (1988) 536. Apart from the odd rule “qui interdisent de faire un *stūpa* avec la nourriture puis de le démolir et de le manger” which the Pāli *Vinaya* shares with that of the Mūlasarvāstivāda according to Bareau (*Bulletin de l’école française d’extrême-orient* 50 (1960) 271 — if that is what *thūpikata* actually means), the only actual occurrence of the term *stūpa* in the Pāli *Vinaya* occurs in the bizarre story concerning “the group of six nuns” found at Vin IV 308-09. Here it said that “the Venerable Kappitaka the Venerable Upāli’s preceptor” destroyed the *stūpa* that “the group of six” had built for one of their deceased members. This story of an uncharacteristically violent and almost sacrilegious act may be peculiar to the Pāli *Vinaya*. The same rule appears to be explained by a very different story in the *Mahāsāṃghika-Bhiksūni-Vinaya*, for example (A. Hirakawa, *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns. An English Translation of the Chinese Text of the Mahāsāṃghika-Bhiksūni-Vinaya* (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, No. XXI) (Patna: 1982) 284-86). It may also be related to what

But if *cetiya* in these contexts, and in the compound *cetiyaṅgana*, is the Pāli equivalent of *stūpa*, then it is equally possible that it is being used in the same way in the two remaining passages we must mention from the *Sutta-vibhaṅga*. *Saṅghādisesa* V prohibits monks from acting as “go-betweens” (*sañcarita*) but notes that “there is no offence if it is for the Order, or for a shrine, or if he is ill; if he is going on business, if he is mad, if he is a beginner” (*anāpatti saṃghassa vā cetiyassa vā gilānassa vā karaṇiyena gacchati, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā ti*).²⁰ Similarly, in the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*, *Pācittiya* XLIV, which prohibits nuns from doing household work, cooking, etc., it is said that “there is no offence if it [cooking, etc.] is a drink of conjev, if it is for the Order; if it is for worship at a shrine ...” (*anāpatti yāgupāne saṃghabhatte cetiya-pūjāya ...*).²¹ If Pāli *cetiya* in these two passages does not refer to what in other *Vinayas* would be called *stūpas* it is hard to know what it could refer to. The *cetiya* in these passages is an “object” for whose worship nuns can properly prepare food and for whose sake monks can engage in

appears to be an explicitly local Sri Lankan resistance to *stūpas* for the local monastic dead. At least the argument against the erection of *stūpas* for “virtuous puthujjana monks” found in the Sri Lankan commentaries is a purely local one: *puthujjanabikkhūnām hi thūpe anuññāyamāne tambapanṇadipe gāmapaṭṭanānām okāso ca na bhaveyya tathā aññesu thānesu*, “for were a *stūpa* to be allowed for puthujjana monks there would be no room for any villages or cities in Tambapanṇadipa (Ceylon), likewise in other places” (P. Masefield, *Divine Revelation in Pali Buddhism* (London: 1986) 23). To what degree this resistance was purely literary remains to be seen although Longhurst already long ago noted that “the *stūpas* erected over the remains of ordinary members of the Buddhist community were very humble little structures. The ashes of the dead were placed in an earthenware pot and covered with a lid, and the humble little *stūpa* erected over it. Plenty of Buddhist *stūpas* of this class may still be seen in the Madras Presidency and also in Ceylon” (A.H. Longhurst, *The Story of the Stūpa* (Colombo: 1936) 14).

²⁰ I.B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, Vol. I (London: 1938) 243; Vin III 143.

²¹ I.B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, Vol. III (London: 1942) 329; Vin IV 301.

activities otherwise forbidden to them. It is unlikely therefore that the term here could be referring to local or non-Buddhist “shrines” — the only other “objects” generally referred to by the term in Pāli canonical literature.²² These considerations, and the fact that the use of Pāli *cetiya* for *stūpa* is virtually assured — as we have seen — elsewhere in the *Sutta-vibhaṅga* would certainly support the possibility that it is so used here as well.

If we keep in mind, then, the equivalence of *cetiya* and *stūpa* which seems virtually certain in two cases in the Pāli *Sutta-vibhaṅga*, and likely in two more, it would appear that the Pāli *Sutta-vibhaṅga*, although it has no rules specifically governing behaviour in regard to *stūpas* or *cetiyas*, takes such behaviour, and the existence of *stūpas* or *cetiyas*, very much for granted when it deals with other matters. The rules governing the division of property, acting as a “go-between”, cooking foods, etc., all take the *stūpa* or *cetiya* and activity undertaken in regard to it as established and fully integrated elements of the monastic life. This, of course, makes the complete absence of rules specifically concerned with *stūpas* or *cetiyas* in the *Khandhaka* even more striking, and would seem to provide yet another argument for concluding that the Pāli *Khandhaka* must originally have contained such rules. But if — as the *Mahā-Parākramabāhu-katikāvata*, the *Visuddhimagga*, and the *Sutta-vibhaṅga* seem to suggest — the Pāli *Vinaya* had originally contained such rules, then the fact that they are no longer found in the *Vinaya* known to us could, apparently, only be explained by assuming that either they had inadvertently dropped out of the manuscripts or, perhaps, were intentionally written out.

²² Cf. B.C. Law, “Cetiya in the Buddhist Literature”, *Studia Indo-Iranica. Ehrengabe für Wilhelm Geiger*, hrsg. v. W. Wüst (Leipzig: 1931) 42-48. That *cetiya* is always used in Pāli literature to refer to a *stūpa* is, of course, not being asserted here.

The comparatively very recent date of the vast majority of the surviving manuscripts for texts in the Pāli canon,²³ coupled with the long and troubled history of their transmission — especially after the 12th Century — could easily account for the loss of material from these texts on a fairly large scale, and makes an uninterrupted transmission of our Pāli texts extremely unlikely. In fact the historical situation would suggest that the transmission was probably interrupted not once, but on several different occasions.²⁴ It is, therefore, possible to think that the loss of “the duties pertaining to Stūpas” could have occurred in just this way. There is at least one consideration, however, which renders this possibility less forceful and may in fact suggest quite a different process.

In the *Vinayas* surveyed by Bareau — those of the Mahīśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka, Mahāsaṅghika, Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin — the rules regarding *stūpas*, though concentrated in the various

²³ See, at least, O. von Hinüber, “On the Tradition of Pāli Texts in India, Ceylon and Burma”, in *Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Phil.-Hist. Klasse. Dritte Folge. Nr. 108) ed. H. Bechert (Göttingen: 1978) 48-57; O. von Hinüber, “Notes on the Pāli Tradition in Burma”, *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, I. Phil.-Hist. Klasse Jg. 1983, Nr.3, 67-79; O. von Hinüber, “Pāli Manuscripts of Canonical Texts from North Thailand — A Preliminary Report”, *Journal of the Siam Society* 71 (1983) 75-88; O. von Hinüber, “Two Jātaka Manuscripts from the National Library in Bangkok”, *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 10 (1985) 1-22; O. von Hinüber, “The Pāli Manuscripts Kept at the Siam Society, Bangkok. A Short Catalogue”, *Journal of the Siam Society* 75 (1987) 9-74; O. von Hinüber, “The Oldest Dated Manuscript of the Milindapañha”, *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 11 (1987) 111-19; P.E.E. Fernando, “A Note on Three Old Sinhalese Palm-Leaf Manuscripts”, *The Sri Lanka Journal of the Humanities* 8 (1982, actually 1985) 146-57.

²⁴ As one of the many possible sources for the troubled history — both internal and external — of the Sri Lankan Saṅgha from the 12th Century on, see Ratnapala, *The Katikāvatas*, 219-32; for Burma see E.M. Mendelson, *Sangha and State in Burma. A Study of Monastic Sectarianism and Leadership* (Ithaca & London: 1975) 31-118; for Thailand, Y. Ishii, *Sangha, State and Society. Thai Buddhism in History* (Honolulu: 1986) 59-66; etc.

Ksudrakavastus, are scattered throughout this *vastu* and, in some of the collections, in other *vastus* or divisions of the *Vinaya* as well.²⁵ They do not occur as a single block. Assuming that much the same held for the Pāli *Vinaya*, that although concentrated in a single *vastu* rules regarding *stūpas* would have been scattered throughout it and elsewhere in the *Skandhaka*, it would be easy enough to see how some of these scattered rules could have been lost through accidents of transmission, but that all such rules would have been lost in this way seems very unlikely. In light of this the total absence of rules regarding *stūpas* in the Pāli *Vinaya* would seem to make sense only if they had been systematically removed. But acknowledging the possibility — if not the likelihood — of such a systematic removal having actually occurred is one thing; knowing why it might have occurred is something else again.

One might be tempted to try to explain any removal from the Pāli *Vinaya* of rules regarding *stūpas* by referring to the purported prohibition of monastic participation in the *stūpa*/relic cult which is supposed to occur in the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta*. This, however, will raise many more questions than answers and, in fact, leads us to much the same conclusion that consideration of the *Katikāvata*, the *Visuddhimagga*, and the *Sutta-vibhaṅga* suggests. First of all — as I hope to show in some detail elsewhere — the “injunction” addressed to Ānanda concerning *sarira-pūjā* has nothing to do with an ongoing cult of relics or *stūpas*.²⁶ This can be shown from the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* itself and

²⁵ Bareau, *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 50 (1960) 229-30.

²⁶ The supposed “injunction” occurs, of course, at D II 141,18 (= *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* V.10). Although the details will have to be given elsewhere, it can, I think, be convincingly shown both that *sarira-pūjā* does not refer to “worship of the relics” but to what we might call “preparation of the body” prior to cremation, and that even as late as the *Milindapañha* the “injunction” at D II 141 was not understood to apply to all monks. Moreover, if this “injunction”, by itself, were to account for the absence of rules regarding *stūpas* in the Pāli *Vinaya* we would expect to find that other schools who had a similar text of the *Mahāparinirvāna-sūtra* would also have no such rules in their *Vinayas*, but this is not the case.

related texts, but it is equally clear from other sources as well that any discomfiture with monastic participation in *stūpa* or relic cult activity is distinctly modern. In the *Udāna* version of the story of “Bāhiya of the Bark Garment”, for example, there is a clear directive to monks to build *stūpas*: “... having seen (the body of Bāhiya, the Blessed One) addressed the monks: ‘you, monks, must take up the body of Bāhiya of the Bark Garment ! Having put it on a bier, having carried it out, you must cremate it, and you must build a *stūpa* for it ! For monks, a fellow-monk has died’.” (... *disvāna bhikkhū āmantesi: gānhattha bhikkhave Bāhiyassa dāruciriyassa sarirakam mañcakam āropetvā niharitvā jhāpetha thūpañ c' assa karotha, sabrahmacārī vo bhikkhave kālañkato ti*).²⁷ The *Apadāna* version of the same story has the Buddha saying to the monks: ... *thūpam karotha pūjetha*, “You must build a *stūpa* ! You must worship it !”²⁸ That these texts give expression to very early practice concerning the disposal of the monastic dead is confirmed by some of the earliest archeological and epigraphical evidence that we have. There is, for example, the group of *stūpas* of the local monastic dead at the monastery complex at Bhāja, “probably one of the oldest Buddhist religious centres in the Deccan”;²⁹ or the old *stūpa* of the “forest dweller” Gobhūti built by his monk pupil at Bedsa;³⁰ or Stūpa no. 2 at Sāñci which held the mortuary remains of the local monastic dead, and which Bénisti has recently argued is older even

than Bharhut:³¹ this *stūpa* appears to have been established and largely funded by monks and nuns.³² The same early kind of evidence proves the early and massive monastic participation in the cult of the relics and *stūpa* of the historical Buddha at Bharhut, Sāñci and Pauni.³³ Clear evidence for the active participation of monks and nuns in the *stūpa*/relic cult is found as well at other sites. At Pangoraria, in Madhya Pradesh, at a very old monastic site, the *yaṣṭi*, or shaft, and umbrella of the main *stūpa* — both of which were very finely worked — were the gift of a *bhikṣuṇī* and her disciples according to the inscription on the shaft which dates to the 2nd Century B.C.E.³⁴ The inscriptions on the Bhattiprolu relic caskets, which have been dated variously from the 3rd to the 1st Century B.C.E., show that monks (*saṃsāra*) took an active and prominent part in the enshrining of the relics of the Buddha (*budhasarira*) there, both as donors and

²⁷ P. Steinthal, *Udāna* (London: 1885) 8,21 (I.10).

²⁸ Bhikkhu J. Kashyap, *The Apadāna* (II) — *Buddhavamsa-Cariyāpiṭaka* [Khuddakanikāya, Vol. VII] (Nālandā-Devanāgarī-Pāli-Series) (Bihar: 1959) 125.16 (54.6.216).

²⁹ See S. Nagaraju, *Buddhist Architecture of Western India* (c. 250 B.C. — c. A.D. 300) (Delhi: 1981) 113-30; 329-30; on the inscriptions associated with these *stūpas* see also D.D. Kosambi, “Dhenukākata”, *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay* 30.2 (1955) 70-71.

³⁰ Nagaraju, *Buddhist Architecture of Western India* 107-8; 329.

³¹ M. Bénisti, “Observations concernant le *stūpa* n° 2 de Sāñci”, *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 4 (1986) 165-70.

³² For the donative inscription connected with the mortuary deposit see J. Marshall, A. Foucher, & N.G. Majumdar, *The Monuments of Sāñci*, Vol. I (Delhi: 1940) 294, although its interpretation there is perhaps not entirely free of problems. Of the 93 donative inscriptions from Stūpa No. 2 at Sāñci published by Majumdar nearly 60%, or 52, record the gifts of monastics: monks — nos. 631, 638, 640, 644, 646, 647, 648, 655, 656, 657, 669, 675, 677, 688, 691, 693, 694, 695, 702, 709, 716, 719, Büh xvii, xviii, xix, xx, 803, 820; Nuns — nos. 662, 663, 664, 668, 672, 674, 678, 700, 703, 706, 708, 713, 714, Büh xxi, 759, 812; Female disciples — nos. 637, 645, 673, 704; Male disciples — nos. 632, 633, 634, 671.

³³ For monastic donors at Bharhut and Sāñci see G. Schopen, “Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: The Layman/Monk Distinction and the Doctrines of the Transference of Merit”, *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10 (1985) 23-24 and notes, although the Sāñci count there is based on the old publications. For Pauni see S.B. Deo & J.P. Joshi, *Pauni Excavations* (1969-70) (Nagpur: 1972) 37-43.

³⁴ H. Sarkar, “A Post-Asokan Inscription from Pangoraria in the Vindhyan Range”, in *Sri Dinesacandrika. Studies in Indology. Shri D.C. Sircar Festschrift*, ed. B.N. Mukherjee, et al. (Delhi: 1983) 403-5.

members of the *gothi* or “committee” that undertook the project.³⁵ Of the many early inscriptions from Amarāvatī recording gifts of monks connected with the *stūpa* cult we might note that “in Maurya characters” which records the gift of a *dhamakathika* or “preacher of the Dharma”.³⁶ An inscription dating from the 2nd/1st Century B.C.E. from Guntupalli indicates that the “steps leading to the circular brick chaitya-griha” were the gift “of the pupil of the Thera, the Venerable Namda”.³⁷ An early 1st Century C.E. inscription from Karle says: “a pillar containing a relic (*sasariro thabho*), the gift of the Venerable Satimita, a reciter (*bhānaka*) belonging to the Dharmottariya School, from Soparaka”.³⁸ A Kharoṣṭī inscription from 32 B.C.E. records the gift of relics made by a monk which were given to “the Mahiśāsaka teachers”.³⁹ If it is true, therefore, as Rhys Davids asserted long ago, that the Pāli *Vinaya* “enters at so great length into all the details of the daily life of the recluses”,⁴⁰ then — oddly enough — this archeological and epigraphical evidence would seem to argue for the fact that either the Pāli *Vinaya* must have originally contained rules referring to such activity, or the Pāli *Vinaya* was unknown or had no influence at these early Indian sites, and they are among the earliest that we can know.

³⁵ G. Bühler, “The Bhāttiprolu Inscriptions”, *Epigraphia Indica* 2 (1894) 323-29; H. Lüders, “Epigraphische Beiträge. I Die Inschriften von Bhāttiprolu”, in *Philologica Indica* (Göttingen: 1940) 213-29; D.C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions Bearing on Indian History and Civilization*, Vol. I, 2nd ed. (Calcutta: 1965) 224-28.

³⁶ J. Burgess, *The Buddhist Stūpas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta in the Krishna District, Madras Presidency, Surveyed in 1882* (Archaeological Survey of Southern India Vol. I) (London: 1887) 94, pl. LVI no. 3.

³⁷ I.K. Sarma, “Epigraphical Discoveries at Guntupalli”, *Journal of the Epigraphical Society of India* 5 (1975) 51.

³⁸ E. Senart, “The Inscriptions in the Caves at Karle”, *Epigraphia Indica* 7 (1902-03) 55, no. 9.

³⁹ G. Fussman, “Nouvelles inscriptions - Śaka (iv)”, *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 74 (1985) 47-51.

⁴⁰ T.W. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist Suttas* (Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XI) (Oxford: 1900) xlvi; my emphasis.

Sri Lankan literary data too suggests monastic concern with and involvement in the relic/*stūpa* cult from the very beginning and, in so doing, would strongly suggest that pre-modern Sri Lankan tradition could not have understood the “injunction” in the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* — or any other passage in the canon — to prohibit monastic participation in the cult. Mahinda, the monk *par excellence* and nominal founder of Sri Lankan monasticism, is presented by the tradition itself as intending to leave the island because “it is a long time since we have seen the Perfect Buddha, the Teacher ... There is nothing here for us to worship”. The reigning king is puzzled and responds “But, sir, did you not tell me that the Perfect Buddha has entered Nirvāṇa ?”; to which the Monk Mahinda responds in turn: “When the relics are seen (or: are present), the Buddha is seen (or: is present)”. The king promises to build a *stūpa*; the Monk Mahinda appoints another monk to fly to India to procure relics; he succeeds; and Mahinda stays.⁴¹ The ‘moral’ of this tale, written by a monk about a monk, seems obvious: the continuance of Buddhist monasticism in Sri Lanka depended on procuring a relic and building a *stūpa* so that the monks would have an object of worship. The relic and *stūpa* cult were, therefore, seen by the author of the *Mahāvamsa* as a primary concern of the monastic community and a necessary prerequisite for its continuance. That such a pivotal part of the institution would have been left out of the rules that governed the early community seems very unlikely.

It would seem, then, that there is much to suggest the likelihood of the interpretation of the *Katikāvata* and *Visuddhimagga* passages, and of the data in the *Sutta-vibhaṅga*, presented here. But even if this interpretation turns out not to be entirely correct, in considering it we have come upon further considerations which seem to indicate at least

⁴¹ W. Geiger, *The Mahāvamsa* (London: 1908) XVII.2-3. On the conception of a relic which is being articulated here see E.W. Adikaram, *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon* (Colombo: 1946) 136 foll.; Schopen, *Religion* 17 (1987) 193-225; Schopen, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 108 (1988) 527-37.

that the absence of rules regarding stūpas in the Pāli *Vinaya* is much more problematic for the historian than has heretofore been recognized. If the interpretation presented here is correct, the Pāli *Vinaya*, like all the *Vinayas* had such rules and they were removed at a comparatively recent date. If this interpretation is not correct, and if the Pāli *Vinaya* did not contain such rules, then it either could not have been the *Vinaya* which governed early Buddhist monastic communities in India, or it presents a very incomplete picture of early and actual monastic behaviour and has — therefore — little historical value as a witness for what we know actually occurred on a large scale at all of the earliest monastic sites in India that we have some knowledge of. The whole question clearly deserves further consideration.

Bloomington

Gregory Schopen

PATNA DHARMAPADA

Part I: Text

The Manuscript

In the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society 21 (1935) pp 21ff., Rāhula Saṅkṛtyāyana described his second visit to Tibet in a search for Indian manuscripts in the summer of 1934. He lists among the MSS he saw at Ngor monastery a Dharmapada (34.1.159). It is not clear when he photographed this MS, but it was presumably during his next visit to Tibet, in 1936 (Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society 23 (1937) pp 1ff.). Since the photographs were taken to Patna, where they are held by the K P Jayaswal Research Institute, I will refer to this MS as Patna. Editions of this MS have been made by N S Shukla (The Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dharmapada, Patna 1979), and G Roth (The Patna Dhammapada, in The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition, Göttingen 1980, pp 93-135). My transcription is based on a photograph of the original photographs, made available to me through the kindness of Prof. Dr H Bechert, der Direktor des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde der Universität Göttingen.

The script of Patna can be classed among those called by Bühler (Indian Palaeography, English edition, Bombay 1904, p 48) Proto-Bengali. He gives among his examples the Deopāra Inscription of Vijayasena (Table V, column XVIII; EI 1 (1882) p 308), dated by Kielhorn in EI 1 to the end of the eleventh century AD; and the Cambridge MSS Add.1699, 1-2 (Table VI, column X) dated 1198-9 AD. To these can be added the Gayā Inscription mentioning Govindapāla (EI 35 (1963-4) p 238) dated 1175-6 AD. All three texts are in Sanskrit, and so contain for the most part different conjunct consonants from Patna.

A comparison of Patna with the Gayā Inscription shows a very close similarity between all the single akṣaras found in both texts, with the exception of *visarga*. (No examples of initial *i*- and *u*-, single *cha*, *jha*,